

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching,
Learning and Teacher Education

Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher
Education

9-1-2013

Understanding the Language of the Occupy Movement: A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis

Theresa Catalano

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, tcatalano2@unl.edu

John W. Creswell

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, jcreswell1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub>

Catalano, Theresa and Creswell, John W., "Understanding the Language of the Occupy Movement: A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis" (2013). *Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education*. Paper 138.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub/138>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Understanding the Language of the Occupy Movement: A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis

Theresa Catalano and John W. Creswell

University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA

Corresponding author — Theresa Catalano, Department of Teaching, Learning & Teacher Education,
University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Henszlik 30, Lincoln, NE 68588, USA; email tcatalano2@unl.edu

Abstract

In the expanding area of narrative inquiry, researchers often battle with the decision of how to analyze/interpret data. The aim of this article is to propose the use of cognitive linguistics as a tool in narrative analysis using as a case illustration interviews conducted in October/November 2011 with participants in the Occupy movement (Occupy). Results expose important metaphors/metonymies that reveal much about the perception of the movement by its inceptors. Not only did the analysis present the movement as a war and a force against government corporations, oppression, and inequality, but it was also seen as a strong structure and a family/community that needed to be awakened, fed, heard, seen, and felt. The contribution of this article lies not only in a greater understanding of Occupy but also in a demonstration of the value that an in-depth cognitive linguistic analysis has to offer in narrative inquiry.

Keywords: cognitive linguistics, Occupy, narrative inquiry, metaphor

Introduction

Narrative research, as an approach to qualitative inquiry, continues to expand across disciplines to include a diverse range of fields (see Holstein & Gubrium, 2012; Reissman, 2008; Wells, 2011). Not only is narrative inquiry flourishing, but it is also evolving, and while still focused on an interest in life experiences as narrated by those who live them, it has found itself taking an important role in liberation movements and in “voicing the stories of marginalized groups” (Chase, 2011; Holstein & Gubrium, 2012, p. 3; Reissman, 2008). Moreover, it has become a way to look at “large social forms such as accounts of political events and social change” (Andrews, 2007; Maynes, Pierce, & Laslet, 2008).

Types of life experience narratives may include those heard in interviews, during fieldwork, as seen in documents (such as reports), electronic data (such as text messages) or in visual forms such as photo diaries or film (see Reissman, 2008, for a discussion of visual narratives; Wells, 2011). If narrative inquiry can be defined as a way of conducting case-centered research, “cases” to be studied can include individuals, identity groups, community organizations, and narratives themselves (Reissman, 2008, p. 11). Analysis of these narratives depends on whether the analysts’ interests lie in the con-

tent, structure, performance, or context of the narrative (Reissman, 2008). For example, if the analyst were interested in what Reissman refers to as the “whats,” that is, looking at the content of the interviews (or other narrative data) then the thematic approach would be a logical choice. Those wanting to know “how” narratives are assembled and conveyed would choose a process-oriented approach focusing on the structure. However, researchers wanting a broad and varied interpretive approach that makes use of elements of structured and process-oriented approaches would take a dialogic/performance approach and those interested in nonverbal forms of communication such as gestures, body movement, sound, and images, might take a visual analysis approach (Holstein & Gubrium, 2012; Reissman, 2008). Although Reissman and others discuss many different approaches and combinations of approaches in analysis, there is no mention in the literature of the use of cognitive linguistics (CL; the study of language and meaning construction) in a thematic or structural approach (or a combination of the two; Daiute & Lightfoot, 2004; Elliot, 2005; Holstein & Gubrium, 2012; Reissman, 2008; Wells, 2011). In fact, there is little written in the field of narrative inquiry about the use of CL, and how to use metaphor/metonymy analysis as a tool in thematic or

structural analysis to help understand the meaning of an experience or event for the narrator. While Reissman and others do occasionally touch on metaphorical analysis in interpreting interview data (and other types of data), it is approached from the theoretical frame of rhetoric as opposed to CL, the use of metonymy is not mentioned, and the purpose is to look at the emotions of the narrator rather than the meaning of the event (Reissman, 2008). Assessing the linguistic meaning of events, such as political and social events, not only widens the analytic tools available to qualitative researchers, it also permits a deeper, more nuanced understanding of world events.

The present article will focus on the use of CL for analysis of qualitative interview data, and use as a case illustration interviews conducted in October and November of 2011 with participants in the Occupy movement (Occupy) at four sites: New York City; Oakland and Berkeley, California; and Lincoln, Nebraska. More specifically, this article examines the CL process of metaphor/metonymy analysis and its application to a narrative study of the Occupy Movement. Our examination will begin by explaining the intent of CL and provide detailed guidelines for metaphorical/metonymical analysis. Next, we will advance the methodology involved in the data collection and analysis of the Occupy interviews, and apply metaphorical/metonymical analysis to the interview data. Finally, we will discuss the limitations and value of this form of qualitative linguistic analysis. In this way, the unique contribution of this discussion will be to highlight a CL approach to narrative analysis.

Narrative Analysis and CL

Narrative research is grounded in the particular, with investigators focusing on specific actors in social places and times (Reissman, 2008). While there are numerous approaches to the analysis of narrative data, Polkinghorne (2005) and others propose that the area to be studied should determine the inquiry methods and type of analysis. Thus, we should not view methods of analysis as a “cafeteria of options,” but as connected to the analysts’ “theoretical sensibilities that shape their procedural choices which is evident in how they present and justify their perspectives, apply their analytic methods and make sense of their empirical material” (Holstein & Gubrium, 2012, p. 6). Therefore, the choice of which type of analysis to conduct depends on what the analyst is looking for in the data. Increasingly, the lines between disciplines and types of analysis have been blurred, precisely for the reason that this allows more freedom to tailor a type of analysis more closely to what the researcher wants to focus on and the type of data collected (Wells, 2011). In the case of interview data of Occupy, the authors wanted to focus on the meaning of the event and had interview data from Occupy participants, which led to the ideal use of a CL approach.

CL provides a little-explored (in the context of narrative inquiry) and in-depth alternative in narrative analysis (Elliot, 2005; Polkinghorne, 2005). CL can be defined as a scholarly perspective to the study of language, conceptual systems, human cognition, and meaning construction (Hart, 2011). Associated with scholars such as Lakoff, Langacker, Talmy, Taylor, Kövecses, Fillmore, and Fauconnier to name a few, it is concerned with how we make meaning of our world and how we define our everyday realities (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). While we cannot actually look inside the heads of our research participants, cognitive linguists believe that communication involves how we conceptualize language, and this language is based on the same system that we use in thought and action. Thus, linguistic structure provides us indirect access to conceptual processes and is in this sense a “window to the mind” (Fauconnier, 1999, p. 96; Hart, 2011, p. 72). This means that it can be a useful tool in uncovering conceptual processes that are important to the communication of ideologies, and thus it is particularly useful in narrative analysis. Furthermore, while this article will discuss in detail the incorporation of CL in narrative inquiry, it is important to note that the authors do not promote the use of CL as the only method of linguistic data analysis. Other additional linguistic approaches, such as critical discourse analysis (CDA), narrative analysis, or conversation analysis, may be used depending on what the author is focusing on.

Metaphor and Metonymy

CL and conceptual metaphor analysis are most familiar to the general academic public through the works of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, and are hardly mentioned in the literature on qualitative research (Schmitt, 2005). From this frame of reference, metaphors are considered to be a conceptual mapping from one semantic *source* domain (the more concrete and clearly organized domain) to a different semantic *target* domain that is more abstract and more difficult to talk about (Kövecses, 2006). For the purposes of this article, these mappings will be referred to as “metaphor” (written in capital letters as per CL conventions) and will include the unconscious metaphors of daily language or those found in the data gathered.

Metaphors can be seen as “conceptual instruments that embody otherwise remote concepts in ways that the public can readily understand” (Santa Ana, 1999) and “. . . are pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action . . .” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 1). In essence, metaphors are largely used unconsciously, and help us to categorize our world as part of an essential process that makes up the “backbone of language and thought” (Kövecses, 2006, p. 17) and they are one of the primary tools we use to reason about ourselves and our world, especially when encountering abstract or complex concepts (Slingerland, 2004).

Metaphors can also be viewed as instruments of social control that make problematic political and moral concepts readily accessible for guided evaluation to the voting public (Santa Ana, 1999). Metaphors “provide schemes, which bundle together the fullness of details, making them clearer and more manageable. In doing this, they make perception more automatic and ease energy required to understand” (Schmitt, 2005, p. 366). Regardless of the context in which they are used, metaphors inevitably highlight some aspects of reality and hide others (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

A salient example of these metaphoric mappings can be found in Santa Ana’s (1999) seminal work on media discourse of migrant workers in the *Los Angeles Times*. This article reported that in this discourse, the dominant conceptual metaphor was IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS. What was actually occurring in the texts were linguistic realizations of this conceptual metaphor such as the following examples:

(5) Wilson said he believed public benefits are a *lure* to immigrants and his intent was to discourage illegal immigration . . .

(10) The truth is, employers *hungering* for really cheap labor *hunt out* the foreign workers . . . (pp. 200-201)

These examples demonstrate the mapping from the *source* domain (animals) to the *target* domain (immigrants) in which immigrants correspond to citizens as animals correspond to humans. Therefore, the characteristics of animals were mapped onto immigrants, thereby justifying their inhumane treatment.

Researchers desiring to incorporate metaphorical analysis into their work would be advised to read some of the academic articles/books from top scholars in the field (see Charteris-Black, 2004; Fauconnier, 1997; Fauconnier & Turner, 2002; Gibbs & Tendahl, 2008; Hart, 2010, 2011; Kövecses, 2006; Lakoff, 2006, 2008; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Langacker, 1987, 1991; Talmy, 1988, 2000; Taylor, 1989/1995; as well as others). In addition, it is helpful to read articles that actually incorporate metaphorical analysis into discourse analysis such as Semino and Masci (1996), Al-Azar (2006), Polson and Kahle (2010), Santa Ana (1999), Hart (2011), and Catalano (2011). An example of successful incorporation of metaphorical analysis to interpret interview data is that of Achugar (2008), in which the author examined how local norms for Spanish use in a multilingual Southwest Texas border responded to dominant monolingual ideologies, and how these ideologies were connected to key conceptual metaphors (see also Velazquez, 2013 for a similar example). For detailed guidelines on the process of metaphor analysis, see Appendix A.

Although there is still some disagreement in the field as to a specific definition of metonymy, most CL scholars would agree that metonymy is when one element

stands for another it is related to or closely associated with to direct attention to (or away from) it (Kövecses, 2006). While some scholars contend that metonymy is a subclass of metaphor (Genette, 1980; Levin, 1977; Searle, 1979), we argue that while metaphor and metonymy are similar in the way they affect or reflect our perception of people and events, they are different and equally important kinds of processes. While metaphors link a *source* domain with a *target* domain (e.g., animals to immigrants), metonymic sources project their concepts onto the target (e.g., the fact that coming into the country without proper documentation is against the law), not by matching counterparts but by imposing a conceptual perspective from which the target is activated (Benczes, 2011, p. 199). This activation causes a shift in attention from source to target (e.g., focusing on the people entering the country with the perspective that the way they enter is a crime) and therefore directs attention to it, or in other cases, away from it (Benczes, 2011; Kövecses, 2006, p. 98). One example of metonymies used to shift attention from *source* to *target* domains comes from the Federation for American Immigration Reform: “*Illegal immigration costs U.S. taxpayers about \$113 billion a year at the federal, state and local level*” (Martin & Rurark, 2011). In this example, the authors attempt to persuade readers of the burden that undocumented immigrants place on American society with the words *illegal immigration* and *taxpayers*. Here we see the metonymy of ACTION FOR AGENT in which immigration stands for the immigrant as well as DEFINING PROPERTY FOR CATEGORY because the term *illegal* calls attention to the way the immigrants entered the United States. Note that the convention in CL is to write metonymies in capital letters with the word that is substituting or standing for the other word coming first. In addition, the use of *taxpayers* (as opposed to other choices such as *us*, *citizens*, or *American people*) gives prominence to one duty of citizens, which is to pay taxes, and ignores other duties that are not relevant to the context (such as voting). It also calls attention to the financial losses of the average citizen and the perceived burden of these immigrants on the public.

Metonymy encompasses a wide variety of types, including complex conceptual interactions with metaphor in which metonymy functions to develop or highlight the source or the target of a metaphor (Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez & Perez Hernandez, 2003). Some common metonymies include DEFINING PROPERTY FOR CATEGORY OR PERSON (*donors, illegals, blonde*), ACTION FOR EVENT (*movement*) INSTITUTION FOR PERSONS (*government, SEC [Securities and Exchange Commission]*), SIMPLIFIED EVENT FOR COMPLEX SUBEVENTS (*issue, situation*), PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT (*I just bought a Mercedes.*) PLACE FOR INSTITUTION (*Wall Street is in a panic.*) and CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED (*Obama bombed Afghanistan.*)

Some key readings on metonymies from a CL framework include those by Barcelona (2002); Kövecses (2002, 2006); Lakoff and Johnson (1980); Panther and Thornburg (2003); Panther and Radden (1999); Radden and Kövecses (1999); Benczes, Barcelona, and Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez (2011); and Bierwiazzonek (2013). One example of the use of metonymical analysis for examining interview data is that of Krišković and Tominac (2009) in which the authors look at metonymy from a CL framework and use metonymy as an explanatory tool for understanding inferences in interviews (from seven short pieces of television discourse) pointing to the role of background knowledge in understanding target meanings. For guidelines to the process of metonymical analysis see Appendix B.

Case Illustration of Metaphors and Metonymies From the Occupy Movement

To illustrate the use of CL and more specifically metaphor and metonymy, we turn to the analysis of the language of participants in the recent Occupy Movement. Occupy is a people-powered movement that began on September 17, 2011, in Manhattan's Financial District that has spread to more than 100 cities in the United States and in more than 1,500 cities globally (Chomsky, 2012). Influenced greatly by the Arab Spring, the main issues of the movement include economic inequality, corporate greed, and the influence of corporations on the government. As the movement completes its 2nd-year anniversary, many people still struggle to understand the movement and its implications for our democratic society. Because most of the public's understanding of the movement hails from largely dismissive media discourse (see Sorkin, 2012), it is important for the public to understand Occupy from the perspective of its participants. It is here that CL (and in particular, metaphor/metonymy analysis) can be an excellent tool to help us comprehend the role of Occupy in social and political change as well as its influence on future movements energized by it.

In-depth interviews of Occupy participants lasting 30 min or more were conducted by the first author in Zuccotti Park, Manhattan, on October 13, 2011, and Centennial Park Mall, Lincoln, Nebraska, on October 21, 2011, Sproul Plaza on the University of California (UC) Berkeley campus, November 9, 2011, and Oakland City Hall on November 11, 2011. Participants met the purposeful sampling criteria of being a participant in Occupy available at the time of the interviews and agreeing to be interviewed. The IRB at our institution approved participant consent when individuals in the Occupy Movement agreed to be interviewed. Reciprocity involved a dialogic approach in which participants asked the researcher-interviewer questions in return for providing answers. According to Guion, Diehl, and McDonald (2011), in-depth interviews feature the fol-

lowing four key characteristics: open-ended questions, semistructured format, a goal of seeking clarity and understanding, and audio-recorded responses with notes. These interviews involve not only asking questions but also systematically recording and documenting the responses to probe for deeper meaning and understanding. In keeping with this framework, two open-ended questions were designed for the interviews, and follow-up questions and dialog were encouraged by the researcher. The questions were as follows: *Why are you here?* (at the Occupy protest site) and *What do you hope to achieve?*

These questions were designed as a way to get behind the movement's real purposes and to give protesters a chance to be heard. The interviews were conducted as a conversation more than a question/answer period, and the first author spent a great deal of time talking to participants off the record before and after the interviews. Interviews were conducted in English and Spanish and recorded on an I-pad using the App. Quick Voice pro. Recordings were transcribed (and in some cases, translated from Spanish into English) by the first author.

Transcribed interviews were imported to MAXQDA (qualitative data analysis software; (1989-2012) and run through a word list to rank lexical items according to frequency. Once this list was produced, the authors examined the list manually searching for patterns, and determining major metaphors and metonymies. These types were then color coded, and lexical searches were carried out under the metaphor/metonymy categories. For triangulation purposes, the data were then reexamined manually to determine other lexical choices that might fall into the metaphorical/metonymical categories, and these were run once more through the MAXQDA coding system. The linguistic realizations for each target domain or metonymical type were then categorized and a chart was created including each type of metaphor and metonymy and its linguistic realizations. The authors then examined these linguistic realizations for common domains, and included examples of these sentences in the discussion of the metaphor/metonymy patterns found in the text.

Metaphor Analysis

Many interesting metaphors were found in the data (see Tables 1-3) that facilitate understanding of how the movement was perceived. One of the most frequent metaphors was THE MOVEMENT IS AN OBJECT. This metaphor (known as an *ontological* metaphor) allows the participants to take their experience of the movement and treat it as a discrete entity or substance so that they refer to it, categorize it, and thus reason about it (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Here is an example of the linguistic realization of this metaphor from the interviews that refers to the movement as something that can be SEEN:

... and if you want to see what we're *envisioning* then just stick around and *see* how we organize ourselves and construct this little community, at this point, it's a community.

Ontological metaphors are sometimes not noticed as being metaphorical (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 27) and in this case, the authors had a difficult time determining the exact source domain. However, after returning to the literature and looking at various examples it was clear that "seeing" is something we can do to objects, and therefore the metaphor THE MOVEMENT IS AN OBJECT was determined.

Another important metaphor found in the data is THE MOVEMENT IS WAR. In this metaphor (salient in the name for the movement: *Occupy*) the participants are the soldiers, the government, corporations and politicians are the adversaries and the various branches of the movement are allies. Here is one example from the data:

Because they're doing exactly what I would want young people to be doing today—*fighting* for their rights of not only their generation but for the future and they have tremendous courage they have sort of *seized* the moment.

Many of the participants interviewed expressed their desire to talk about the issues, problems, and injustices in the United States today. This leads to the next most frequent metaphor, THE MOVEMENT IS A DIALOG. This recursive metaphor (in the sense of talking about wanting to talk) became a reality during the interview process. Below is an example.

Table 1. Metaphors With Target Domain: Occupy Movement.

Source domain	Examples
OBJECT	See, focus on, envision
WAR	Fight, defending, assault, struggle, revolution, take over, fall out, allies
A DIALOG	Talking, dialog, conversation
A BUILDING	Structure, framework, support, construct
A FAMILY/ COMMUNITY	Community, family, brothers, and sisters
A PLANT	Acorn, taken root, root cause, growing
LIFE	Birth, death, die, birthplace, die down
A JOURNEY	Course, walking toward, down the way
FOOD	Come to the table, fed up
AN ARTIST	Creativity, creative, recreate, chip in
A FORCE	Force, building, apply our energy
TRANSNATIONAL	Across borders, international, around the world
A FIRE	Igniting, fire in the belly, hazing out

More idealistically, I'd like to see, you know, a really *self-reflective conversation* take place in this nation about what is really valuable . . .

Some of the participants expressed to the author during interviews the sense of community and family that they felt by living together in such close quarters and having such close contact with people on a continual basis. In today's overconnected hypertechnological world, many people expressed joy in the continual human interaction that Occupy provided as well as the interconnectedness to nature. Here are some of those comments:

- This *community* is an example of a democracy in a very pure form.
- That's what the world is showing us right now, that's what *nature* is showing us. All systems in nature are integral, they're *interconnected* and they're mutually responsible . . .

There were many more metaphors found referring to the movement itself, such as the movement is A PLANT, LIFE, A JOURNEY, FOOD, AN ARTIST, A FORCE, TRANSNATIONAL, and A FIRE. Examples of linguistic manifestations of these conceptual metaphors as well as other sources such as the government and corporations can be found in Tables 1 to 3.

Metonymy Analysis

When attempting to comprehend how metonymies work, it is helpful to consider a list of different words that could be used to refer to an entity, event, or person. In the case of the name for the movement as it began in New York, the choice of this name is interesting and strategic. The word Occupy represents the metonymy of ACTION FOR EVENT in which the word OCCUPY stands for the complex, multilocation, and multipurpose social event. In addition, the metonymy PLACE/ INSTITUTION FOR ACTION/PERSONS is present with the words *Wall Street* standing for the actions that occur on this street, and the people that commit them,

Table 2. Metaphors With Target Domain: The Government.

Source domain	Examples
SYSTEM	Political system, change the system, systemic problems
BANKERS	Putting in money, allocating money, sending them money
CORPORATIONS	Government is run by corporations, corporate money, interpenetration of government in corporate life
MAFIA	System, small number of families that control, goons

in this case, CEOs and corporate greed. Both of these words refer to the actions involved in the events, and create a sense of mobility, displacement, and a journey (when the word *Movement* is attached). In fact, as New York Times columnist Samy Alim (2011) notes, “It is almost impossible to hear the word *occupy* and not think of the Occupy Wall Street movement.” According to Alim, the use of this term has put terms like “inequality” and “greed” in the center of political discourse that has made it more difficult for Washington to promote the spurious reasons for the financial meltdown and the unequal outcomes it has exposed and further produced. This term is also used ironically as it is generally used for military and police operations, yet due partly to the use of this word, Americans have been forced to think differently about the word and have changed its meaning and thus language itself (Chomsky, 2012). Occupy “now signifies standing up to injustice, inequality and abuse of power” and is no longer about just occupying space, it is about transforming it (Alim, 2011). This traditionally transitive verb is now being used in a variety of grammatical slots such as modifier of nouns (e.g., *Occupy movement*) and is representative of how metonymies can influence perceptions.

Some other interesting metonymies found in the data (see Table 4 for a complete list) include SOUND FOR POWER (e.g., *a voice, to be heard* stand for having the power to express one’s opinion), BODY PART FOR ACTION (a type of PART FOR WHOLE, for example, *have a hand in government* standing for having power, *I’m all ears . . .* stand for the action of listening), and SEASON FOR EVENT (e.g., *Arab Spring, American Fall* stands for the political/social uprisings). In summary, debate still continues as to the impact that Occupy has had on American politics and society in general, but in-depth analysis such as that allowed by CL can give us insight into a better understanding of the movement through the window of perception that metaphor and metonymy allow us to see through.

Conclusion

This study has introduced the scholarly analytic perspective of CL, and demonstrated its use as a tool in narrative analysis. Important metaphors and metonymies found in the data revealed the movement to be perceived as constantly changing and dynamic (PLANT, JOURNEY, DIALOG). As in life, it has had a *birthplace*,

Table 3. Miscellaneous Metaphors.

Source domain	Target domain	Examples
POSSESSIONS/OBJECTS	BENEFITS	Take it away, scrapped, things, fixed
USING OUR SENSES	UNDERSTANDING	Get a feel for, seeing the people, feeling
A FORCE	INJUSTICE	Building, accelerating, crescendo
ADVERSARY	POLICE	Enemy, not our friends, wrong, beating on people, brutality
INVISIBLE/INAUDIBLE	PEOPLE	Not heard, not recognized
CONSCIOUSNESS	PROTESTING	Awake, wake up, be conscious to the fact
POWER	PROXIMITY	Stand alongside, on the side of
PERSON	FREEDOM	Exercise our rights, free speech is dead
WILD ANIMALS/BEASTS	CORPORATIONS	Have no reigns, ravaging beasts, reign in, free

Table 4. Metonymies.

Category	Examples
PART FOR WHOLE/WHOLE FOR PART	We are America, collecting, Occupy all ears
DEFINING PROPERTY FOR CATEGORY	These people, donors, professor, citizen, people who make decisions, Latin American
ACTION FOR EVENT	Movement
INSTITUTION FOR PERSONS	Government
SIMPLIFIED EVENT FOR COMPLEX SUB-EVENTS	Issue, movement
SOUND FOR POWER	A voice, to be heard, speak up
BODY PART FOR ACTION	Hand in government, all ears
RESULT FOR ACTION	Budget cuts, fee hikes
PLACE FOR EVENT/PERSONS	Wall Street, come to the table
PRESENCE FOR OPPOSITION/CHANGE	Be a body, dedicate my thoughts and my body
SEASON FOR EVENT	Arab Spring, American Fall

a birth, a real life, and it has begun to die down. Like a fire, it has been hazed out. Not only did it present the movement as a WAR and a FORCE against government (SYSTEM, BANKERS, MAFIA), corporations, oppression, and inequality, but it was a strong structure (BUILDING) put in place by TRANSNATIONAL ARTISTS that formed a FAMILY/COMMUNITY that needed to be AWAKENED, FED, to be HEARD, SEEN, and FELT.

The limitations of the CL approach lie in its macro-level examination and thus metaphor/metonymy analysis provides incomplete and indirect answers to questions asked about socioeconomic circumstances (Schmitt, 2005). It is also possible that phenomena not able to be recorded in metaphorical/metonymical language fall outside of the focus of the analysis (Schmitt, 2005). For this reason, triangulation with other forms of evaluation (such as CDA) is highly recommended.

What then do metaphor, metonymy, and a CL perspective tell us about the Occupy Movement and the understanding of an event/experience in general? What do they contribute to an analysis that other types of narrative analysis could not? Namely, it is the under the surface, unconscious perceptions of the movement by its participants that are revealed to the readers through systematic analysis of CL phenomena. This in-depth analysis allows us to view the movement as the inceptors and participants do, as opposed to how it has been portrayed in media reports.

CL concepts such as metaphor and metonymy provide a greater understanding of conceptualization, which takes place during discourse and results in mental representations of the situations and events described (Hart, 2011). Metaphor and metonymy are just the tip of the iceberg in CL and just two of many ways we perceive, comprehend, and interpret the world around us (called "construal operations") identified in CL that may be ideologically significant (Hart, 2010). Many other intriguing concepts are available for analysis as well such as frames/ICMs (ways in which we arrange our knowledge of the world), categorization, deixis, and epistemic modality (to name a few; Hart, 2011). CL offers important theoretical insights into the communication of ideology situated at the interpretation stage. In the case of Occupy, some of the more prevalent values and beliefs regarding the movement were exposed through CL analysis and interpretation of interviews, such as wanting to have a conversation about how to change the political system, the interconnectedness of people with each other and with nature, and the sense of community that was built from long-term physical proximity and face-to-face dialog, something that is lacking in the technology-dependent world of today.

Although we have explored in detail the use of metaphor/metonymy analysis in narrative inquiry, CL has much more to contribute to analysis. We suggest that other concepts (such as frames and epistemic modal-

ity) be explored for their possibilities as analytic tools, as well as more research that attempts to understand how CL can contribute to the field of narrative inquiry. In addition, more research needs to be done that explores the use of CL to analyze other areas in narrative analysis such as visual data, observations, or how to integrate CL into a chronological story.

Regardless of what remains to be learned, it is clear that interviewing, in particular when combined with methodology taken from CL is a powerful method in which educational researchers can elucidate their subjects of study for the public and begin to understand better what is behind social movements such as Occupy and their compelling quest for social and political change.

Appendix A

Guidelines for Metaphor Analysis

When attempting to find metaphors in the data, Schmitt (2005) identifies several rules that aid in systematic analysis. According to Schmitt, a metaphor can be determined when

- A word or phrase, strictly-speaking, can be understood beyond the literal meaning in context of what is being said.
- The literal meaning stems from an area of physical or cultural experience (source area) . . .
- Which is in this context transferred to a second, often abstract, area (target area). (p. 384)

To reconstruct the metaphorical models, Schmitt suggests to

- Group all the metaphorical terms, which describe the same (concrete-sensory) source area and the same (abstract) target area together.
- Then give them a title summarizing the metaphorical model in the equation (and use all caps to refer to the metaphor, as this is the convention in CL).

Here is an example of how this process would look using data from the Occupy interviews. In the case of referents to the Occupy Movement itself, the authors examined the word list generated using MAXQDA and identified lexical items with many tokens such as *fight*. The author then searched for similar words that might collocate with this word and came up with *defending, assault, struggle, revolution, take over, fall out, and allies*. It was not difficult to conclude that a theme or category that all of these words fall under would be WAR; therefore, these terms were coded as Occupy MOVEMENT IS WAR and all tokens under this code were calculated. In some cases, the decision of what metaphor to put lex-

ical items under is not so easy. For example, in the case of lexical items such as *health care* and *education*, words such as *take it away*, *scrapped*, *things*, *fixed* were examined in context, and were finally determined to be ontological metaphors of BENEFITS ARE POSSESSIONS/OBJECTS. As a general rule, when there is a doubt about what metaphorical category to put the words under, we would suggest that analysts try two things. First, refer to texts such as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (2006) for examples of metaphors. The target might be different but there is often a similar source, and it is helpful to find examples from the texts. Second, triangulate and read the data again looking carefully at the context, then ask a research partner or colleague to read over the data and see if they come up with a similar metaphor. If they don't, you are off track and need to try again. If they come up with something similar, you need to decide which one would encapsulate the most lexical terms found under that category in the most contexts. Santa Ana (2002) provides a helpful example of the process of metaphor analysis and triangulation on pp. 56-58 in his book.

Appendix B

Guidelines for Metonymy Analysis

Antonio Barcelona has identified some general steps to identifying metonymies that aid the analyst in distinguishing between metaphor and metonymy, and understanding how to categorize metonymies (taken from pp. 38-43). They are as follows:

1. Observe where the mapping takes place.

Here, it is important to understand that in metonymies, the mapping is within the same domain (that is, one element should stand for something related or closely associated with it). For example, in the Occupy data, the metonymy *I'm all ears* would be classified as metonymy according to Step 1), as *ears* stands for the act of *listening* that is of course associated with the body part that allows us to listen, and is therefore within the same semantic domain.

2. Characterize the metonymy in precise terms/look for additional evidence.¹

To do this, you must look for evidence of this metonymy used in other contexts and examples where the signifier (in this case *ears*) demonstrates the same signified (listening). A simple www.google.com search would aid in finding evidence for the meaning of a particular metonymy. For example, in the case of a www.google.com search of "*I'm all ears*" the most common meaning attributed to this expression is *listening*. Therefore, *to be all ears* in this case stands for *to listen*. The search also revealed other possible meanings such as a person with

long or big ears. In this case, it is a simple procedure because there is no other body part associated with listening and the main function of ears is as an auditory organ. However, in other cases it is not such an easy task and the analyst must always greatly rely on the context in interpretation. For this reason, it is impossible to use computer software such as MAXQDA without a close read from the analyst as well.

3. Try and recognize the most general metonymic mapping.

Lakoff (1987) as well as some of the other suggested readings might be helpful here, but what is missing is a book that has an exhaustive list of possible metonymies that students can use to double-check with during analysis. Basically, what Barcelona is asking us to do here is to find what other examples there are of body parts standing for their typical function. Here are a few:

- She has a good **head** for business.
- John has good **legs**. He can walk for miles without getting tired.
- The kids have good **eyes**. They don't miss a thing.

So from the above examples it is clear that the general metonymic mapping in common here is BODY PART FOR ACTION (or attributes connected with them). The final step is then:

4. Describe the particular metonymy in the particular context in which it is used.

So, referring back to the context (below), it is clear that the expression *to be all ears* in this case stands for the action of listening, and fits under the metonymical mapping of BODY PART FOR ACTION because it is the only possibility found in Steps 1 to 3 that would make sense in this context.

- Frankly, when somebody comes up with a coherent resolution to how to have an alternative, then **I'm all ears** but right now it's just in the formative stages.

At this point it is important to note that we have greatly simplified the procedure, particularly by providing a clearcut and simple example from the data. However, often it is not such a simple process and a great deal of work must go into the process of Steps 1 to 4, particularly with unconventional metonymies.

Note

1. This step has been simplified and combined with another step from Barcelona (2002).

References

- Achugar, M. (2008). Counter-hegemonic language practices and ideologies: Creating a new space and value for Spanish in Southwest Texas. *Spanish in Context*, 5, 1-19.
- Al-Azar, R. (2006). Italian immigration policies: The metaphor of water. *Bologna Center Journal of International Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://bcjournal.org/2006/italian-immigration-policies/>
- Alim, S. (2011, December 21). What if we occupied language? *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/12/21/what-if-we-occupied-language/>
- Andrews, M. (2007). *Shaping history: Narratives of political change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Barcelona, A. (2002). Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor within CL. In R. Dirven & R. Porings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 21-48). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Benczes, R. (2011). Putting the notion of "domain" back into metonymy: Evidence from compounds. In R. Benczes, A. Barcelona, & J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez (Eds.), *Defining metonymy in CL: Towards a consensus view (Human cognitive processing)* (pp. 197-215). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Benczes, R., Barcelona, A., & Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Defining metonymy in CL: Towards a consensus view (human cognitive processing)*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Bierwiazczonok, B. (2013). *Metonymy in language, thought and brain*. Sheffield, UK: Equinox.
- Catalano, T. (2011). Barack Obama: A semiotic analysis of his Philadelphia speech. *Issues in Political Discourse Analysis*, 3, 47-74.
- Charteris-Black. (2004). *Corpus approach to critical metaphor analysis*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chase, S. (2011). Narrative inquiry: Still a field in the making. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 421-434). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Chomsky, N. (2012). *Occupy*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Daiute, C., & Lightfoot, C. (2004). Editors' Introduction: Theory and craft in narrative inquiry. In C. Daiute & C. Lightfoot (Eds.), *Narrative analysis: Studying the development of individuals in society* (vii-xvii). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Elliot, J. (2005). *Using narrative in social research: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Fauconnier, G. (1997). *Mappings in language and thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, G., (1999). Methods and generalizations. In T. Janssen & G. Redeker (Eds.), *Scope and foundations of cognitive linguistics* (Cognitive Linguistics Research Series, pp. 95- 128). Hague, Netherlands: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Genette, R. (1980). *Narrative discourse*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W., Jr., & Tendahl, M. (2008). Complementary perspectives on metaphor: CL and relevance theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 1823-1864.
- Guion, L., Diehl, D., & McDonald, D. (2011). *Conducting an in-depth interview*. FCS6012, one of a series of the Department of Family, Youth and Community Sciences, Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. University of Florida. Retrieved from <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdf/FY/FY39300.pdf>
- Hart, C. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science: New perspectives on immigration discourse*. Hertfordshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hart, C. (2011). Moving beyond metaphor in the cognitive linguistic approach to CDA: Construal operations in immigration discourse. In C. Hart (Ed.), *Critical discourse studies in context and cognition* (pp. 71-92). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. (2012). Establishing a balance. In J. A. Holstein & J. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of narrative analysis* (pp. 1-11). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2006). *Language, mind, and culture: A practical introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Krišković, A., & Tominac, S. (2009). Metonymy based on cultural background knowledge and pragmatic inferencing: Evidence from spoken discourse. *FLUMINENSIA*, 21, 49-72.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2006). *Thinking points: Communicating our American values and vision*. New York, NY: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Lakoff, G. (2008) *The political mind: Why you can't understand 21st-century politics with an 18th-century brain*. New York, NY: The Penguin Group.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Volume 1. Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R. (1991). *Concept, image, and symbol*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Levin, S. R. (1977). *The semantics of metaphor*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Martin, J., & Ruark, E. (2011). *The fiscal burden of illegal immigration on United States taxpayers. Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR)*. Retrieved from http://www.fairus.org/site/DocServer/USCostStudy_2010.pdf?docID=4921
- MAXQDA, Software for Qualitative Data Analysis. (1989-2012). *VERBI Software – Consult – Sozialforschung GmbH*. VERBI GmbH: Berlin, Germany.
- Maynes, M. J., Pierce, L. J., & Laslet, B. (2008). *Telling stories: The use of personal narratives in the social sciences and history*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Panther, K. U., & Radden, G. (1999). *Metonymy in language and thought (Human cognitive processing)*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

- Panther, K. U., & Thornburg, L. L. (2003). Introduction: On the nature of conceptual metonymy. In K. U. Panther & L. L. Thornburg (Eds.), *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing* (pp. 1-22). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Polkinghorne, D. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 137-145.
- Polson, E., & Kahle, S. (2010). Limits of national discourse on a transnational phenomenon: A case study of immigration framing in the BBC online. *International Communication Gazette, 72*, 251-268.
- Radden, K.-U., & Kövecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. In K.-U. Panther & G. Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in language and thought* (pp. 17-29). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Reissman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez, F., & Perez Hernandez, L. (2003). Cognitive operation and pragmatic implication. In K. U. Panther & L. L. Thornburg (Eds.), *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing* (pp. 23-50). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Santa Ana, O. (1999). Like an animal I was treated: Anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 191-224.
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Schmitt, R. (2005). Systematic metaphor analysis as a method of qualitative research. *Qualitative Report, 10*, 358-394.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). Metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (1st ed., pp. 92-123). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Semino, E., & Masci, M. (1996). Politics is football: Metaphor in the discourse of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy. *Discourse & Society, 7*, 243-269.
- Slingerland, E. (2004). Conceptual metaphor theory as methodology for comparative religion. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion, 72*, 1-31.
- Sorkin, A. R. (2012, September 18). Occupy Wall Street: A frenzy that fizzled. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://dealbook.nytimes.com/2012/09/17/occupy-wall-street-a-frenzy-that-fizzled/>
- Talmy, L. (1988). The relation of grammar to cognition. In B. R. Ostry (Ed.), *Topics in CL* (pp. 165-205). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics. Vol. 2: Typology and process in concept structuring*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Taylor, J. R. (1995). *Linguistic categorization*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1989)
- Velazquez, I. (2013). Individual discourse, language ideology and Spanish transmission in El Paso, Texas. *Critical Discourse Studies*. doi: 10.1080/17405904.2013.789975
- Wells, K. (2011). *Narrative inquiry*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

About the Authors

Theresa Catalano has a PhD in second language acquisition and teaching from the University of Arizona. She is currently an assistant professor of second language education/applied linguistics at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln.

John W. Creswell holds a PhD in higher education studies and sociology from the University of Iowa. He is currently a professor of educational psychology at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln.